

Boundary Integral Methods for the Poisson Equation of Continuum Dielectric Solvation Models

Lawrence R. Pratt, Gregory J. Tawa, Gerhard Hummer,
Angel E. García, and Steven A. Corcelli

Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545

LA-UR-95-2659

(February 5, 2008)

Abstract

This paper tests a dielectric model for variation of hydration free energy with geometry of complex solutes in water. It works out some basic aspects of the theory of boundary integral methods for these problems. One aspect of the algorithmic discussion lays the basis for multigrid methods of solution, methods that are likely to be necessary for similarly accurate numerical solution of these models for much larger solutes. Other aspects of the algorithmic work show how macroscopic surfaces such as solution interfaces and membranes may be incorporated and also show how these methods can be transferred directly to periodic boundary conditions. This dielectric model is found to give interesting and helpful results for the variation in solvation free energy with solute geometry. However, it typically significantly over-stabilizes classic attractive ion-pairing configurations. On the basis of the examples and algorithmic considerations, we make some observations about extension of this continuum model incrementally to reintroduce molecular detail of the solvation structure.

1. Introduction

This paper tests a dielectric model [1,2] for variation of hydration free energy with geometry of complex solutes in water. It works out some basic aspects of the theory of boundary integral methods for these problems and describes, demonstrates, and tests such algorithms for solution of that macroscopic Poisson equation. It then makes some observations about extension of this continuum model incrementally to reintroduce molecular detail of the solvation structure.

Numerical solution of these models has been discussed many times before [3–25]. Dielectric continuum models are widely considered simplistic descriptions of the solvation of charged or polar solutes in solutions. Thus, it might not be obvious whether accurate solutions to the governing Poisson equation are important. However, when solved to thermal accuracy these models can give helpful and interesting descriptions of the variation of solvation free energy with geometry [26,27]. These dielectric models are physical. Furthermore, their connection with molecular theory is known and straightforward [26–28,31–34]. For these reasons the dielectric models deserve to be exploited more thoroughly than they have been. These interesting properties of the physical model require methods that yield solvation free energies accurate on the thermal energy scale ($< k_B T \approx 0.03 eV$ under the conditions of widest interest). Experience has shown that this level of accuracy can be difficult to achieve and requires careful numerical methods [21,23–25].

The Poisson equation is a linear equation and the chief difficulty is associated with the treatment of interface boundary conditions on a molecular surface that can be irregular. The possibility of disconnection of the molecular surface with molecular rearrangement is of utmost physical importance. Viewed from a physical level, those disconnections can produce microscopic solvent pockets that the model treats as bulk continuum solvent. It might be questioned whether the model is significantly less accurate in those circumstances. Viewed on a technical level, those disconnections greatly complicate the description of the molecular-solvent interface. Because spatial resolution in the description of that interface is important

to achieving accuracy in the solutions, it might be further questioned whether it is feasible or desirable to obtain solutions of the models that are sufficiently accurate to examine the effects of those disconnections. But boundary element approaches are expected to be particularly appropriate for these purposes. This has been clearly expressed by Yoon and Lenhoff [14]. The development here follows that idea but accomplishes the required boundary (or surface) integrations utilizing two simple procedures: (a) plaques are defined on the basis of quasi-random number or ‘good lattice’ multidimensional integration methods [35–40]; and (b) integrations over plaques are accomplished by Monte Carlo methods. This results in the computational method that is simple and general, that lends itself to demonstration of numerical convergence, and that permits a systematic exploitation of coarse grained results.

The *a priori* theoretical support for these models is limited; it has been mentioned above that they are physical and have a known simple connection to molecular theory. An additional point that is important for molecular justification of the continuum theory is that the interactions being treated, electrostatic interactions, are long-ranged on the scale of molecular sizes [41,42]. Because the theoretical justification of these models is limited, empirical validation for the anticipated applications is important. Therefore, this paper presents a number of examples of dielectric model predictions of potentials of mean forces for rearrangements of molecular species and reactive complexes in water. It deserves emphasis that the issue of the validity of these models for predictions of changes in solvation free energy with changes in molecular geometry is distinct from those of accuracy for one geometry or of accuracy for changes in charge distribution at a fixed geometry. Most of the previous applications, electronic structure calculations and electron transfer theories, appear to rely on answers to the latter question. Preliminary results for several of the examples below have appeared in our previous work [26,27]. But with the exception of [43,44] this is the only available work that obtains and studies potentials of mean forces, *i.e.* variations of solvation free energies with geometry, accurate on the thermal energy scale. Note also [45]. Reference [43] provided an important motivation for the present work.

2. Physical Model

We consider a molecule in a solution environment and identify that molecule as the ‘solute’ of interest. A solute volume is defined on the basis of its geometry. Partial charges describing the solute electric charge distribution are positioned within this volume. The Poisson equation of interest is

$$\nabla \bullet \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \Phi(\mathbf{r}) = -4\pi \rho(\mathbf{r}) \quad (1)$$

where $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ is the density of electric charge associated with the solute molecule, the function $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$ gives the local value of the dielectric constant, and the solution $\Phi(\mathbf{r})$ is the electric potential.

2.1. Integral equations for the model

When contributions from an external surface vanish, the fundamental solutions of this Poisson equation are solutions of the integral equations:

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \int_V \nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \bullet \left[\frac{\nabla'' \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{4\pi \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')} \right] \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') d^3 r'', \quad (2a)$$

$$G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') - \int_V [\nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'')] \bullet \left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') - 1}{4\pi} \right) [\nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}')] d^3 r'', \quad (2b)$$

$$G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \int_V G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \left[\frac{\nabla'' \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{4\pi \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')} \right] \bullet \nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}') d^3 r''. \quad (2c)$$

The derivation of these equations is discussed in an appendix. Here $G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is the Green function for Eq. (1) — the electric potential at $\mathbf{r}$ due to a unit source at $\mathbf{r}'$ — and $G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is the Green function for the case where $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) = 1$. These equations apply both to the ‘unbounded case’ and to periodic boundary conditions. For the latter case the potential is only required in a cell of volume V and the integral need only cover that volume. But in the latter case the electric potential due to a unit source “ $G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ ” is then the traditional Ewald potential. That result also is discussed in an appendix. It will be worthwhile to note

that Eqs. (2) are specializations of the more general relations that arise from considering how to calculate $G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ for a specified $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$ with the help of a separately known $G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ corresponding to $\varepsilon^{(0)}(\mathbf{r})$. Those more general relations are:

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(\mathbf{r})G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') &= \varepsilon^{(0)}(\mathbf{r})G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \\ &+ \int_V \varepsilon^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \bullet \left(\frac{1}{4\pi} \right) \left[\nabla'' \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{\varepsilon^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}'')} \right) \right] \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') d^3 r'', \end{aligned} \quad (3a)$$

$$G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') - \int_V \left[\nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \right] \bullet \left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') - \varepsilon^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}'')}{4\pi} \right) \nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') d^3 r'', \quad (3b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}') &= G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \varepsilon^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}') \\ &+ \int_V G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \varepsilon^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}'') \left(\frac{1}{4\pi} \right) \nabla'' \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{\varepsilon^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}'')} \right) \bullet \nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}') d^3 r''. \end{aligned} \quad (3c)$$

Again, the derivation of these equations is discussed in an appendix. These equations will be of subsequent help in the design of numerical methods to treat systems for which the solute volume is not efficiently described as a finite collection of finite spheres, *e.g.*, systems that include slabs and cylinders.

2.2. Molecular Volume and Boundary

In the customary applications of dielectric models a molecular volume is defined and the region outside this molecular volume is assigned a local value of the dielectric constant, $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$, equal to the measured dielectric constant of the solution. It is with the definition of the molecular volume that molecular scale information of the solvation structure, otherwise external to the model, is incorporated. It should be recognized that the defined molecular volume typically will change with the thermodynamic state of the system, with the structure of the solute, with solute-solvent interactions, and with correlations among solvent molecules. We comment later on the statistical thermodynamical underpinning of the model that clarifies the molecular origin of that information. The description of the molecular surface should be simple and should permit disconnection with molecular rearrangement.

Smoothness is desirable. The most popular previous choice has been the Connolly surface [46] defined as a surface of contact between a spherical probe and the van der Waals surface of the molecule. We have chosen instead to define the volume of a molecular complex in terms of a collection of spheres, each member s of that collection having an individually specified radius, $R(s)$, and center, $\mathbf{c}(s)$. The volume enclosed by spheres in this collection is the ‘molecular volume.’ It is expected that the molecular volume will contain the source charges but that limitation could be straightforwardly relaxed. The molecular surface is defined as the boundary of the molecular volume. Generally, some of the surfaces of the individual spheres will be inside other spheres; some spherical surface will be buried and will not contribute to the molecular surface.

Our considerations for making this choice of the molecular surface rather than the Connolly surface are that it is simpler and no less physical. The Connolly surface has the advantage of better smoothness for compact molecular conformations. But it has the disadvantage that disconnection upon continuous conformational change either leaves sharp ‘cusps’ or, if those cusps are arbitrarily shaved-off, the volume changes discontinuously. Since the statistical thermodynamic connection of the defined molecular surface to the solvation structure is somewhat indirect, involving solvent molecular sizes also, the differences between the present choice of molecular surface and the Connolly surface is not significant physically.

This choice, and the Connolly choice also, yields a molecular surface that is generally not a Liapunov surface [47]. That smoothness condition is an important feature of general abstract discussions of boundary element methods [47]. The importance of the smoothness of the surface for general discussions can be exemplified by considering the case of the traditional Dirichlet problem: solution of $\nabla^2\varphi(\mathbf{r}) = 0$ within a closed volume with $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$ specified on the boundary. If, for example, the boundary does not have a unique surface normal then discussions involving the normal derivative of $\varphi(\mathbf{r})$ on the boundary become vexed. The significance of this point for our applications can be discussed on the basis of Eq. (2a). The homogeneous contribution $G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is continuous, smooth, and differentiable away from

sources and, on the assumption that no sources are located precisely on the surface, on the boundary of the molecular volume also. In order to isolate potential problems we can focus on the integral of Eq. (2a). We notice that the discontinuous function $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$ appearing in the denominator can be cancelled exactly and that the factor $G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}')$ is expected on the basis of Eq. (1) to be continuous and finite away from sources and thus on the boundary in our problem. [In fact, we can typically arrange it to be non-negative. Then Eq. (2a) can be a natural basis of Monte Carlo calculations.] If we agree not to require computation of the electric field precisely at points where no unique surface normal exists, then the only potential difficulty to consider is associated with the integrability of the surface dipole contribution to the electric potential at a point off the boundary at positions of the sources. But those contributions are clearly integrable and thus only a problem of practical difficulty.

2.3. Comments

Some points of note about Eqs. (2) are: first, Eq. (2b) is simple to interpret physically. It says that the net electrostatic potential of a charge is composed of the potential due to polarization induced in the medium by electric fields there in addition to a direct, or bare interaction. Second, for the conventional applications $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$ is a sharp step at the molecular surface and thus the integrals of Eqs. (2a) and (2c) are surface integrals over the molecular surface. Although these equations are obviously twins, they offer different physical pictures of the problem. The integral of Eq. (2a) describes a discontinuous function of $\mathbf{r}$; that discontinuity is consistent with the obvious discontinuity of the left-side of Eq. (2a). The integrand is a continuous function, however, for $\mathbf{r}$ not on the boundary. For $\mathbf{r}$ inside the molecular volume where $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) = 1$, the integrand of Eq. (2a) can be viewed as the potential due to a dipolar surface density $G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$. The integrand of Eq. (2c) can be considered to be the potential due a surface charge density $(4\pi\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}''))^{-1}\nabla''\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') \bullet \nabla''G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}')\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}')$. For this case, the integrand varies discontinuously with normal displacement through the molecular surface because the normal electric field is discontinuous at a sharp step in $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$. If we evaluate that negative gradient normal to the molecular surface by assuming that it is half the sum of

the inside and outside values, we obtain from Eq. (2c) the equation that provides the basis for the most widely used of previous boundary element calculations [1,3,6,10,12,14,15,18]. This is discussed in an appendix. Eq. (2c) can be written more physically for the electric potential of Eq. (1) as

$$\Phi(\mathbf{r}) = \Phi^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) + \int_V G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \left(\frac{\nabla' \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}')}{4\pi\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}')} \right) \bullet \nabla' \Phi(\mathbf{r}') d^3 r' \quad (4)$$

with the requirement that $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) = 1$ wherever $\rho_f(\mathbf{r}) \neq 0$. Here $\Phi^{(0)}$ is the electric potential in the absence of the medium.

In constructing and analyzing practical solutions it is helpful to recognize simple applications of Gauss's law, for example to Eq. (2a)

$$\int_V \nabla' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \bullet \nabla' \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}') d^3 r' = -4\pi \Delta \varepsilon \eta(\mathbf{r}) \quad (5)$$

where $\eta(\mathbf{r})$ is one or zero if the observation point $(\mathbf{r})$ is inside or outside, respectively, the molecular volume.

3. Examples

All examples here used $\varepsilon = 77.4$ in the solvent. The quantities presented in these examples are the potentials of the mean forces obtained as

$$W = U + \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \int \rho(\mathbf{r})(\Phi(\mathbf{r}) - \Phi^{(0)}(\mathbf{r})) d^3 \mathbf{r}. \quad (6)$$

U is the static energy of the solute in the absence of the solvent. Typically, a constant contribution to W is adjusted so that this potential of mean force is zero at some asymptotic separation of interest. The distribution of free charge $\rho(\mathbf{r})$ is a sum of partial charges so the integral of Eq. (6) reduces to a sum over those charges. That is not an important limitation, clearly. Except where noted, we used the same charge distribution employed in obtaining the simulation results used as a comparison.

All our results below were obtained on the basis of either Eqs. (2a), or (2c), or both, utilizing methods described subsequently. Wherever possible we used the radii-parameters

of Ref. [48]. Otherwise we adopted van der Waals radii arbitrarily and will note those values in the specification of the example calculations. We note that knowledge of the helpful work Ref. [49] would probably have permitted better initial estimates of the required radii-parameters. However, we reiterate our expectation that variation of hydration free energies with geometry place a different demand on the dielectric model and upon radii-parameters than do total free energies or total free energy changes upon reaction. We expect that qualitative conclusions drawn below would not be changed by reasonable alterations of the radii-parameters used.

Energy units on the following graphs are either $k_B T$ or kcal/mol. That choice was governed by the energy units chosen in reporting the original results that we are using for comparison. For all the results here $k_B T \approx 0.59 \text{ kcal/mol}$ and that smaller unit was typically adopted where more refined analyses were pursued.

We note that practioners are not yet unanimous regarding the most appropriate boundary conditions to use for electrostatic interactions in simulation calculations of the sort we rely on here. Different boundary condition choices can lead to quite different results. We have exercised some judgement in choosing simulation results to use. In some cases, we have not used simulation results that are substantially the same as those we have used. In some other cases, however, we have excluded simulation results that display obvious dubious features, even though those features do not presently have a clear explanation.

Our results below are based upon solutions of Eq. (1) that are believed to be accurate to about $0.3 k_B T$ for the total solvation free energy for the worst cases. The principal difficulty we have encountered is the following: Numerical solution of Eq. (1) requires replacement of a continuous problem with a discrete one. The results of different calculations can change practically discretely [23–25] unless special care is taken to avoid that and this is especially important for changes in geometry. For example, the position or number of lattice points can change discontinuously depending on the geometry and how the numerical problem is organized. Such changes can be small on the scale of the total solvation free energy, *e.g.* 0.5% of the whole, but large and puzzling on the scale of the potentials of mean force. None

of those features are evident in our results below. Thus, we believe our results presented here are the correct solution of the dielectric model for the problems considered. A major emphasis of the subsequent discussion of numerical methods is placed upon getting correct and correctly continuous variation of the free energy with geometry.

3.1. $\text{Na}^+ \cdots \text{Cl}^-$ pair potential of mean force in water

A variety of theoretical results [26,27,43,50–53] for the potential of mean force between a $\text{Na}^+ \cdots \text{Cl}^-$ ion pair in water are shown in Fig. 1. We note that the XRISM [53] and the dielectric model calculations agree in properly describing the asymptotic $1/\epsilon r$ behavior. All results show a contact minimum at about 2.6-2.8 Å. The repulsive, short-distance side of this contact minimum is due to the effect of the solvent in pulling the ion pair apart. The direct ion core overlap repulsion begins to be significant only for distances less than 2.5 Å.

The two dielectric model calculations used different molecular surfaces. The earlier work of Rashin [43] employed a Connolly surface [46]. The later calculation [26] used the van der Waals surface. The comparison of Fig. 1 shows that those differences in the molecular surfaces are important in the region of the free energy barrier. However, the close equality of those results near the contact minimum suggests that the differences in the molecular surfaces used are not important in that region of inter-ionic separations.

On this basis, we restrict our conclusions here to the region of the contact minimum. We conclude that the dielectric models predict that contact-paired ions are too stable relative to the dissociation limit. The XRISM approximation is somewhat better in this regard but still errs in predicting too much stability for the contact ion pair. These errors are appreciable on the kT energy scale so that predictions of probability densities would be in error by factors of about 3.

We note that including a modeled polarizability of the solvent and solute species does not seem to have a big effect on the predicted $\text{Na}^+ \cdots \text{Cl}^-$ pmf for distances less than about 8 Å [54].

3.2. $\text{Cl}^- \cdots \text{Cl}^-$ pair potential of mean force in water

A variety of theoretical results [43,50,52,53] of the potential of mean force between a $\text{Cl}^+ \cdots \text{Cl}^-$ ion pair in water are shown in Fig. 2. All results except ‘molecular dynamics 92’ agree in properly describing the asymptotic $1/\epsilon r$ behavior. Those exceptional molecular dynamics results were obtained at a non-zero salt concentration.

The two dielectric model calculations used different molecular surfaces: Ref. [43] adopted a Connolly surface [46]; the present adopted the van der Waals surface with the same radii-parameters. The dielectric model predictions are entirely repulsive.

3.3. $\text{t-butyl}^+ \cdots \text{Cl}^-$ potential of mean force in water

Fig. 3 shows theoretical results for approach of a Cl^- ion to a planar t-butyl^+ for ion-pairing configurations. The Monte Carlo and XRISM results are taken from Ref. [55]. For the dielectric model calculations, the radius for the tertiary carbon was taken as $R = 1.85\text{\AA}$; for the united atom methyl groups those radii were $R = 2.00\text{\AA}$ [60]; for the chloride the Rashin-Honig [48] value $R = 1.937\text{\AA}$ was used. Again, the dielectric model predicts too much stability of contact pairs relative to the dissociated fragments. The XRISM approximation is somewhat better but errs in the same direction by about $4k_B T$ or about a factor of 55 in the associated radial distribution function.

The results of Ref. [44, Figure 5] cannot be conveniently placed on this graph.

3.4. $\text{Na}^+ \cdots \text{dimethylphosphate}^-$ ion pair potentials of mean force in water

For the $\text{Na}^+ \cdots \text{dimethylphosphate}^-$ complex ion pair two sets of theoretical results are available [56,57]. For both cases, the conformation of the dimethylphosphate anion was held rigidly in the *gg* structure of the fragment as described by electronic structure calculations [58]. In the first ‘asymmetric’ case the Na^+ ion was brought up along a P-O bond of an exposed oxygen atom; see Fig. 4. In the second ‘symmetric’ case the Na^+ ion was brought up along the bisector of the O-P-O angle involving exposed oxygen atoms; see Fig. 5.

Beyond the sodium radius [48] of $R = 1.68\text{\AA}$, the radii used in this case were van der Waals radii of Ref. [60]: phosphorus, $R = 2.10\text{\AA}$; oxygen(ester), $R = 1.65\text{\AA}$; oxygen(phosphate), $R = 1.60\text{\AA}$; united atom methyl, $R = 2.00\text{\AA}$. In the asymmetric case, the *gaussian bath* approximate theory agrees closely with the molecular dynamics results. The XRISM and dielectric model over-stabilize the asymmetric contact ion pairs. For the symmetric approach the molecular dynamics results are different from all the other theoretical results. Those theoretical results err by about $4k_B T$ or about a factor of 55 in the first peak for the associated radial distribution function.

We have not used the results of Ref. [59].

3.5. Chloride exchange in methyl chloride by symmetric S_N2 in water

Fig. 6 shows available results for the model S_N2 reaction by a symmetric exchange of chloride in methylchloride along a linear reaction path [61–63]. Beyond the chloride radius $R = 1.937\text{\AA}$ [48], we used radii [60]: hydrogen, $R = 1.00\text{\AA}$; carbon, $R = 1.85\text{\AA}$. We used the partial charges of [61] except for reaction coordinates in the range $-1\text{\AA} < r < 1\text{\AA}$ where we used the revised model charges of [63]. Our dielectric model result appears to be in good agreement with the earlier work of Ref. [44] that was based upon AM1 electronic structure model coupled to the dielectric medium. The agreement seen between dielectric models and the Monte Carlo results is good, better than that agreement between XRISM and Monte Carlo.

3.6. Nucleophilic addition of hydroxide to formaldehyde in water

Fig. 7 shows available results for the attack of formaldehyde by hydroxide through a S_N2 mechanism [64,65]. We used radii [60]: hydrogen, $R = 1.00\text{\AA}$; oxygen (hydroxide), $R = 1.65\text{\AA}$; oxygen (carbonyl), $R = 1.60\text{\AA}$; carbon, $R = 1.85\text{\AA}$. The prediction of the dielectric model is qualitatively correct but with large quantitative errors. It has been shown that these quantitative errors can be empirically corrected by a reparameterization that pays no attention to physicality [27]. The XRISM results are quantitative in better

agreement with the Monte Carlo data but that XRISM approximation still incurs substantial quantitative errors, over-stabilizing the compact configuration relative to the dissociated species.

3.7. Conformational equilibrium of N-methylacetamide in water

All the examples here have been considered in order to test the theoretical model and not as a study of the particular system. Thus, the fidelity of the interaction model used for the molecular simulations to laboratory experiments has been less a concern than the correctness of the simulation results for the interaction model used. This point deserves particular emphasis for the N-methylacetamide example considered next. The conformations and interaction models that have been studied in this case appear not to be very realistic. However, the value of the simulation work as a benchmark result against which theoretical models can be compared remains.

What has been done is to define two planes as follows: plane # 1 is defined as the plane of the H(N), CH₃(N), and the C(carbonyl). Plane # 2 is the plane of the CH₃(C), O, and the N. Then with the C(carbonyl) and the N atom fixed, all other bond lengths and angles fixed, and all force field parameters such as charges fixed, these planes are rotated relative to each other by an angle ω about the C(carbonyl)-N line. The *trans* conformation, which is the lowest energy conformation in the gas phase, corresponds to $\omega = 180^\circ$. The *cis* conformation is $\omega = 0^\circ$.

The infelicities of this study as a description of laboratory experiments are essentially two. The first was discussed in Ref. [66]. The description followed here using partial charges that are independent of conformation predicts that the *trans* isomer has a larger dipole moment than the *cis* isomer. Electronic structure calculations order the sizes these dipole moments oppositely [66,67]. Because the modelled dipole moments do not display a correct dependence on conformation, the implied solvation contributions appear to be incorrect in preferentially stabilizing the *trans* conformation. When this feature of the molecular model is revised, the solvated free energies of the *cis* and *trans* conformers are substantially the

same [66].

The second difficulty has to do with the path chosen in these studies for interconversion of the two conformers of interest. A more detailed study would show that a natural path for interconversion of these isomers would be very different from the simple rotation of the planes defined above. Thus the results here should not be taken as a realistic description either of the net free energy difference between the two isomers or of the variation of free energy along a natural reaction path.

However, a most important attribute of a test of theoretical model is that it is applied for precisely the same circumstances that characterize the experimental data. The available data are satisfactory for that purpose and such a comparison is given in Fig. 8 [68]. The radii-parameters used were $R_{H(N)} = 1.25\text{\AA}$, $R_{acetyl-methyl} = 1.955\text{\AA}$, $R_{N-methyl} = 1.90\text{\AA}$, $R_C = 1.875\text{\AA}$, $R_N = 1.625\text{\AA}$, $R_O = 1.48\text{\AA}$. The comparison shows that the dielectric model and all the other theories shown, except the XRISM approximation, give the right net solvation free energy. The apparent structural feature in the region $90^\circ < \omega < 120^\circ$ is missed by all the theories.

4. Methods

We specialize Eqs. (2a) and (2c) or (4) by taking the observation point $\mathbf{r}$ definitely just inside or outside that molecular surface defined above. In each case we then obtain a closed integral equation that can be solved to provide the information that determines the desired solution everywhere else. The integral in those boundary integral equations goes over the two dimensional surface of the molecular complex. The surface integral might be approximated by sampling the molecular surface using pseudo-random number series, quasi-random number series, or lattice rules [35–40]. These sampling points are equidistributed on the surface of the molecular volume. The development below eventually advocates using one of the latter two methods to define plaques on the molecular surface and then the use of Monte Carlo methods — with pseudo-random number series — to accomplish integrations over the plaques. For clarity of exposition, however, we first describe the direct ‘sampling’ of

the integrand. This sampling permits the evaluation of integrals over the molecular surface. In any of the cases anticipated, the integrand linearly involves the unknown quantities such as $G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$. Therefore, these methods of approximating the integral produce a finite set of linear equations that can be solved by standard methods.

4.1. Direct Sampling of the Molecular Surface

We begin by writing out the equations used with direct, or elemental, sampling of the molecular surface, treating Eq. (2a) first. We introduce the notation

$$\int_V G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \rho(\mathbf{r}') d^3 r' \equiv \Phi^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}), \quad (7)$$

and similarly for $\Phi(\mathbf{r})$. We here focus on $\mathbf{r}$ infinitesimally outside the molecular surface. We will denote the external (solution) dielectric constant by ε_s and the molecular volume will be assigned a dielectric constant ε_m . An appropriate discretized version of Eq. (2a) is then

$$\varepsilon_s \Phi(\mathbf{r}_i) = \Phi^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}_i) + \sum_j w_{ij} \Phi(\mathbf{r}_j) \quad (8)$$

where the coefficients are obtained as

$$w_{ij} = \frac{(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j) \bullet \hat{\mathbf{n}}_j}{|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|^3} \times \frac{(\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_m)}{4\pi} \times \left(\frac{4\pi R(s_j)^2 \eta(\mathbf{r}_j)}{M(s_j)} \right), \quad i \neq j. \quad (9)$$

Here $R(s_j)$ is the radius of the sphere s_j whose surface is sampled by the j th sampling point and $\hat{\mathbf{n}}_j$ is the unit vector normal to the molecular surface at that sampled point. $\eta(\mathbf{r}_j)$ is an indicator function for the non-buried surface; it is *zero* if the j th sampling point is on buried surface and *one* if it is not. $M(s_j)$ is the number of sampling points used for sphere s_j . The left-most factor of $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$ of Eq. (2a) is ε_s because we are utilizing this equation for $\mathbf{r}$ just outside the molecular surface. The diagonal terms in this matrix of coefficients are simply obtained by noting that the potential just outside a uniform sheet of dipoles is $2\pi \times$ (the surface density of moment). Thus we have

$$w_{jj} = 2\pi \times \frac{(\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_m)}{4\pi} \times \eta(\mathbf{r}_j) = (\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_m) \eta(\mathbf{r}_j) / 2. \quad (10)$$

With these specifications, Eq. (8) can be solved directly to yield the potential on the molecular surface. It is clear that sampling points on buried surface do not contribute to the physical resolution of the potential at the molecular surface beyond entering into evaluation of the matrix elements through the normalization numbers $M(s_j)$. As long as this normalization is properly maintained, sampling points on buried surfaces can be preemptively deleted from the list of sampling points.

Note how this procedure works when applied to the simplest problem: the molecule is a single sphere with a charge at the center; $\varepsilon_s = \varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon_m = 1$. We know that the potential is the same everywhere on the molecular surface. If we sample the surface only at only one point ($M(s_j) = 1$) we find that the potential at the sampled point is

$$\frac{1}{R} \times \frac{1}{\varepsilon - w_{11}} = \frac{2}{(\varepsilon + 1)R}.$$

The correct answer is $1/\varepsilon R$. This example suggests the slight modification of Eq. (10) that arises from a slightly more refined estimate of the solid angle subtended by the molecular surface element at the j th sampling point:

$$w_{jj} = (\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_m)(1 - M(s_j)^{-1/2})\eta(\mathbf{r}_j)/2. \quad (11)$$

This refinement can be derived by assuming that the j th plaque has area $4\pi R(s_j)^2/M(s_j)$ and that area is bounded by a circle, *i.e.* each plaque is a circular cap with the spatial extent determined by the average. With this modification and only one sampled point ($M(s_j) = 1$), the present method produces the exact answer for the potential at the surface when applied to this simplest problem. With this modification, the simple ‘one-point’ calculation satisfies the row sum rule $\sum_k w_{jk} = 0$ that follows from the application of Gauss’s law Eq. (5).

This method works straightforwardly. The continuum model results of Ref. [26] show what can be achieved with this primitive approach. We note that the difference between Eq. (10) and (11) was observed to be important in those calculations. One limitation is that to get accurate solutions the matrix w_{ij} sometimes must be large, *e.g.* $10^4 \times 10^4$. For our present interests, ‘accurate’ has been gauged by the results for the solvation free energy. For the case $\varepsilon_m = 1$ this is

$$\Delta\mu = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \int_V \rho(\mathbf{r}) \left(\Phi(\mathbf{r}) - \Phi^{(0)}(\mathbf{r})\right) d^3r, \quad (12)$$

should be correct on the thermal energy scale $k_B T$ and should display reasonable variations on this energy scale with variations of the solute geometry. Other properties of the solutions of these equations can be more sensitive. The electric fields in the interior of the solute are examples of such properties. We close this section by considering another of those more sensitive properties but still a property of physical interest, a molecular polarizability modelled on dielectric idealizations.

The method above offers a simple way to model the polarizability of a solute molecule, by assigning a dielectric constant $\varepsilon_m \neq 1$ to the molecular volume [69]. This possibility is helpful for the physical fidelity of these models but also provides a tougher test of the numerical methods used. To establish a value of ε_m on the basis of a prescribed information about the net polarizability α we proceed as follows. Choose $\varepsilon_s = 1$ and augment $\Phi^{(0)}(\mathbf{r})$ to include a uniform external electric field:

$$\Phi^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) \leftarrow \Phi^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) - \mathbf{r} \bullet \mathbf{E}^{(0)}. \quad (13)$$

We then use the methods here to determine $\Phi(\mathbf{r})$ far from the solute molecule. More specifically, we calculate

$$\frac{\partial p_\gamma}{\partial E_\eta^{(0)}} \equiv \alpha_{\gamma\eta} \quad (14)$$

where the dipole moment $\mathbf{p}$ is computed from a specified origin. We note that the equation to be solved, consider Eq. (2a) for example, is linear. Therefore a *response* to a particular contribution $\Phi^{(0)}(\mathbf{r})$ can be computed independently of other contributions. Thus, we can calculate $\alpha_{\gamma\eta}$ without consideration of the charge distribution of the solute. It is a property only of the parameter ε_m and the shape of the molecular volume. It is independent of a coordinate system origin. With the specifications here we solve

$$\varepsilon_m \Phi_\eta(\mathbf{r}_i) = -\mathbf{r}_i \bullet \hat{\mathbf{e}}_\eta + \sum_j w_{ij} \Phi_\eta(\mathbf{r}_j) \quad (15)$$

as above. $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_\eta$ is a unit vector along axis η . We then form the desired modeled net polarizability from

$$\alpha_{\gamma\eta} = (1 - \varepsilon_m) \hat{\mathbf{e}}_\gamma \bullet \sum_i (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{c}(s_i)) \frac{R(s_i)}{M(s_i)} \Phi_\eta(\mathbf{r}_i). \quad (16)$$

The distance of the plaque point $\mathbf{r}_i$ from the center of its sphere $\mathbf{c}(s_i)$ arises because the surface dipoles are oriented along the outward pointing normal to the surface. As an example, consider a sphere of radius R , sample the surface at only one point $\mathbf{r}$ and use Eq. (11). The result is

$$\alpha_{\gamma\eta} = (\varepsilon_m - 1) R^3 \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbf{e}}_\gamma \bullet \mathbf{r}}{R} \right) \left(\frac{\mathbf{r} \bullet \hat{\mathbf{e}}_\eta}{R} \right). \quad (17)$$

The exact result is

$$\alpha_{\gamma\eta} = \left(\frac{\varepsilon_m - 1}{\varepsilon_m + 2} \right) R^3 \delta_{\gamma\eta}. \quad (18)$$

The trace of the approximate result is in error by a factor of $3/(\varepsilon_m + 2)$ that is natural. But the approximate result is crudely non-spherical. This property thus provides a tougher test of the numerical solution than does the solvation free energy because this property depends more sensitively on the uniformity of the sampled points. This property is therefore helpful in discriminating different solutions, *e.g.*, with different levels of sampling.

4.2. More Thorough Sampling for Integration over Plaques

One way to go beyond the method described above to obtain more accurate computations is to evaluate the matrix elements more accurately. This step in achieving higher accuracy does not increase the dimension of the set of linear equations that must be solved; solving the linear equations is the computational limitation of the method above. We note further that the integrands are singular and, for typical molecular surfaces considered, discontinuous. These latter qualities are expected to make these integrals tough candidates for higher-order integration schemes.

The method described here defines plaques, as suggested above, and then, in order to simplify the problem, assumes that one of the integrand factors can be treated as slowly

varying over each plaque. Such an assumption is satisfactory when the numbers of plaques are large and, consequently, the spatial extent of each plaque is small. Thus, we can be sure that the numerical solution converges to an accurate result as the number of plaques tends to infinity, just as with the method above. However, we expect the rate of convergence of these subsequent methods to be superior.

We begin the development by defining plaques. The plaques will be defined as the Voronoi polyhedra of the plaque points on the non-buried surface of the each sphere. Typically the boundaries of the plaques will include the boundaries of intersection of spheres. The plaque points might be constructed with one of the ‘sampling’ methods mentioned above. For the present development it is not required that the method of construction of the plaque points be one that might be used for direct estimation of the integrals. It is natural though to include uniformity of distribution of the plaque points plus uniformity of size and shape of the plaques, and compactness, as *desiderata*. As specific examples, we have satisfactorily used both quasi-random number series as a sampling for the spherical surface, and the Lubotzky-Phillips-Sarnak [35–40] spherical lattice to construct plaque points. We will denote the set of plaque points by $\{\alpha\}$.

In addition to the plaque points $\{\alpha\}$ we will require another larger set of points that sample the molecular surface uniformly and will be used to accomplish integrations over the plaques. We have typically used Monte Carlo methods with pseudo-random numbers to generate this set of points that will be denoted by $\{i\}$. When the plaque points are constructed to be reasonably uniformly distributed on the surface — even though only a finite set of points are used — we would typically include those plaque points in the set $\{i\}$.

The present method can then be described by consideration of Eq. (2a). We assume that the $G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}')$ appearing in the integral there is accurately a constant on each plaque. The equations for the off-diagonal coefficient $w_{\alpha\beta}$ that follow from this assumption are

$$w_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{R(s_\beta)^2(\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_m)}{M(s_\beta)} \sum_{\{i \in \beta\}} \frac{(\mathbf{r}_\alpha - \mathbf{r}_i) \bullet \hat{\mathbf{n}}_i}{|\mathbf{r}_\alpha - \mathbf{r}_i|^3}, \quad \alpha \neq \beta. \quad (19)$$

The set of points i that are within the plaque β is then denoted by $\{i \in \beta\}$. $M(s_\beta)$ is the

number of points, sampling points plus the plaque point, on the sphere that supports plaque β . Formulae for the diagonal element $w_{\alpha\alpha}$ that follow from the assumption that $G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}')$ is constant over a plaque are

$$\Omega_\alpha/4\pi \approx \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{1}{M(s_\alpha)} \right) \sum_{\{i \neq \alpha\}} (1 - \cos \vartheta_{i\alpha})^{-1/2}, \quad (20)$$

and

$$w_{\alpha\alpha} = \left(\frac{\Omega_\alpha}{4\pi} \right) (\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_m). \quad (21)$$

The derivation of this result is depicted in Fig. 9 and discussed in an appendix. As indicated in detail by Eq. (11), this applies to the case that the plaque point α is exposed. In Eq. (20), $\vartheta_{i\alpha}$ is the angle between the surface normals at point α , the plaque point, and the sampled point i . That formula arranges to use sample points *outside* the plaque α to calculate the solid angle subtended by that plaque at that plaque point. The purpose of that arrangement is to reduce the variance of that Monte Carlo estimation. Note that all sample points, buried or not, on the surface of the sphere that supports plaque α should be used in the estimation but whether any sample point resides within or without plaque α depends on resolution of buried surface. Eqs. (19), (20), and (21) are remarkably similar to Eqs. (9) and (11) and remarkably simple.

4.3. Refinement for higher resolution

The left subscript index of $w_{\alpha\beta}$ indicates a point on the molecular surface where the electrostatic potential is sought. It is straightforward to evaluate these matrix elements for points additional to the plaque points. It is straightforward to evaluate the bare potential at additional points also. Evaluation of those quantities permits a simple calculation of a refined approximate $\Phi(\mathbf{r})$ once a preliminary or coarse solution, call it $\bar{\Phi}(\mathbf{r})$, is obtained. We ‘iterate once’ Eq. (8) with the preliminary solution used on the right:

$$\varepsilon_s \Phi(\mathbf{r}_\alpha) = \Phi^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}_\alpha) + \sum_{\beta} w_{\alpha\beta} \bar{\Phi}(\mathbf{r}_\beta). \quad (22)$$

In pushing to higher resolution, it is particularly helpful to note the requirement $\sum_{\beta} w_{\alpha\beta} = 0$. This follows from Gauss’s law applied to Eq. (2a) when $\mathbf{r}$ is outside the molecular volume.

4.4. Coarsened equations

A closed set of coarsened equations can be obtained from Eqs. (22) by the following argument: In the calculation of the matrix element $w_{\alpha\beta}$ it was assumed that the potential was constant over the plaque β . It is therefore conceptually consistent to consider $\bar{\Phi}(\mathbf{r}_{\beta})$ to be the average of the potential over the plaque rather than the value of the potential at one central point, the plaque point $\mathbf{r}_{\beta}$. With this choice of $\bar{\Phi}(\mathbf{r})$ as the plaque average, the plaque average of the finer resolution Eq. (22) then gives a coarse-grained equation that is closed in these plaque averaged quantities:

$$\varepsilon_s \bar{\Phi}(\mathbf{r}_{\alpha}) = \bar{\Phi}^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}_{\alpha}) + \sum_{\beta} \bar{w}_{\alpha\beta} \bar{\Phi}(\mathbf{r}_{\beta}). \quad (23)$$

Use of this equation prior to the higher resolution refinement Eq. (22) has the advantage that the coarse solution will then already satisfy the refinement in the plaque mean. The magnitude of the correction due to higher resolution refinement is then reduced.

There is an alternative to this procedure that is typically advantageous, sometimes computationally simpler though requiring more memory, but also conceptually more indirect. We arrive at this alternative procedure by the following argument: we formulate a high resolution set of discrete linear equations using Eqs. (19), (20), and (21). We then appeal to a coarser tessellation of the molecular surface and require that all the points of the fine lattice that reside on the same coarse plaque have the same potential. This requirement produces an overdetermined set of linear equations that can be analyzed with the traditional application of singular value decomposition [70] to produce the solution that minimizes the mean square residual of fine resolution equations. This approach attempts to utilize the fine-scale spatial variation of the $\Phi^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}_{\alpha})$ in constructing a coarse solution.

4.5. Surface Charges

An alternative implementation of Eq. (4) holds an advantage for applications of traditional electronic structure packages [71]. That advantage derives from the fact that the induced electrostatic fields are represented with surface distributions of charge. Traditional electronic structure packages can use collections of charge monopoles simply. If the surface charge distributions are represented by a collection of monopoles then the utilization of traditional electronic structure packages is logistically simplified. In this section we describe how the ideas above are adapted to utilization of Eq. (4) in those applications.

As with the development above we first specialize Eq. (4) to extract a boundary integral equation. This is discussed in further details in the appendix. We evaluate formally the gradient of that equation and then consider how to interpret the results for $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$ a sharp step at the molecule surface. We interpret integrand factors that become discontinuous in that circumstance as the average of the values inside and outside that discontinuity. We then take the observation point $\mathbf{r}$ just inside the molecular surface and notice that we obtain the simple closed equation

$$\hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}) = \hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \mathbf{E}_0(\mathbf{r}) + \int_S \hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \nabla G_0(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \left(\frac{\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_m}{4\pi\varepsilon_s} \right) \hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}') d^2r' \quad (24)$$

for the Maxwell displacement normal to the molecular surface at the point $\mathbf{r}$. $E_n^0(\mathbf{r})$ is the component of the bare electric field — due to ρ — normal to the molecular surface at the point $\mathbf{r}$. Eq. (24) involves a surface integral only because it is already specialized to treat a sharp surface. As noted above, this equation provides the basis for the most widely used previous boundary element approaches for these problems [1,3,6,10,12,14,15,18]. The discretized version of Eq. (24), comparable to Eq. (8), is

$$D_n(\mathbf{r}_i) = E_n^0(\mathbf{r}_i) + \sum_j w_{ij} D_n(\mathbf{r}_j), \quad (25)$$

where the off-diagonal coefficients are given by

$$w_{ij} = - \frac{\hat{\mathbf{n}}_i \bullet (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)}{|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|^3} \times \frac{(\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_m)}{4\pi\varepsilon_s} \times \left(\frac{4\pi R(s_j)^2 \eta(\mathbf{r}_j)}{M(s_j)} \right), i \neq j. \quad (26)$$

The diagonal contributions can be obtained by noting that when the plaques are small, their curvature can be neglected and that, since the plaque point is immediately inside the plaque, edge effects may be neglected in a first approximation. The integration required in Eq. (24) is then *minus* the electric field due to a planar sheet with charge density $(\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_m) D_n(\mathbf{r})/4\pi\varepsilon_s$. This electric field just inside has magnitude $2\pi \times$ (that surface charge density) and is anti-parallel to the outward directed surface normal. Thus

$$w_{jj} = (\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_m)\eta(\mathbf{r}_j)/2\varepsilon_s. \quad (27)$$

The refinement corresponding to Eq. (11) is here

$$w_{jj} = (\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_m)(1 - M(s_j)^{-1/2})\eta(\mathbf{r}_j)/2\varepsilon_s. \quad (28)$$

After D_n is obtained on the molecular surface, we review the antecedents of Eq. (24) to see how to obtain the thermodynamic quantity $\Delta\mu$ of Eq. (12). When all the free charges are in regions where $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) = \varepsilon_m$, the induced potential should be calculated as

$$\Phi(\mathbf{r}) - \Phi^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}) = - \int_S G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \left(\frac{\varepsilon_s - \varepsilon_m}{4\pi\varepsilon_s\varepsilon_m} \right) \hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}') d^2r', \quad (29)$$

in close similarity to Eq. (4). Again, the refinement of Eq. (28) produces the exact answer for the simplest problem, the spherical ion with charge at the center mentioned above, when the surface is sampled at one point only.

4.6. Coarse and Finer Solutions with Surface Charges

The arguments above that identified a higher resolution approximate and the ‘self-consistent’ coarse equations carry through for the present surface charge of the adjoint prespective also.

5. Molecular theoretical perspective

Here we note some points of prespective gained by an appreciation of how the dielectric models for solvation free energies connect to molecular theory. Some of these points have

been noted before [26–29,31–34]. But they seem not be widely appreciated. Further, new points here clearly indicate how to improve simply the predictions of potentials of mean force while utilizing the methods detailed above.

The molecular theory corresponding to these dielectric models is the second-order cumulant approximation

$$\Delta\mu \approx \Delta\mu_0 + \left\langle \sum_j \varphi(\mathbf{j}) \right\rangle_0 - \frac{\beta}{2} \left\langle \left(\sum_j \varphi(\mathbf{j}) - \left\langle \sum_k \varphi(\mathbf{k}) \right\rangle_0 \right)^2 \right\rangle_0. \quad (30)$$

Here $\varphi(\mathbf{j})$ is the electrostatic interaction potential energy coupling the solute to solvent molecule $\mathbf{j}$. The brackets $\langle \cdots \rangle_0$ indicate the thermal average in the absence of those electrostatic couplings and $\Delta\mu_0$ is the excess chemical potential of the solute at infinite dilution again in the absence of electrostatic interactions. When the solute is an infinitely dilute second component this molecular approximation is perturbation theory through second order in the electrostatic interactions. When the molecule is not literally an infinitely dilute second component the ‘infinite dilution’ restriction means that one molecule is distinguished for the purposes of calculation. This is still a natural theory but the medium now contains a non-zero concentration of molecules mechanically identical to the ‘solute.’ The medium properties non-perturbatively reflect that fact. From the perspective of this molecular theory, the dielectric solvation model application neglects the zeroth and first order terms, makes an estimate of the second-order term, and neglects all succeeding contributions. Refs. [28,29,31] can be consulted for alternative views.

In view of the generally satisfactory predictions of the dielectric models in the examples above, it is reasonable to conclude that the approximate molecular theory of Eq. (30) would provide a valid description of those systems also but with further molecular detail [33,34] and without the empiricism encoded in the radii-parameters of the dielectric model. That empiricism does in fact limit the ability to use the model for prediction. In the examples of the inter-ionic potentials of mean force above, it is clear that the dielectric model is not satisfactorily accurate. But even then, it is a reasonable view that the failures of the model are due principally to failure in suitably describing the molecular volume rather than an

essential failure of the perturbative formula Eq. (30).

A direct implementation of Eq. (30) would require simulation calculation. Such calculations are likely only to be somewhat simpler than the direct simulation of the potential of mean force sought. Thus, to extend the theoretical insight that Eq. (30) is physically valid, other tricks must be found. One additional idea is to attempt to calculate the first-order and second-order terms in the molecular theory on the basis of the dielectric models. Direct use of that idea is likely to be unsuccessful because those terms in the molecular theory require analysis of the solvation of a discharged solute and the dielectric model is unlikely to be accurate for discharged solutes. However, a physically equivalent but operationally distinct expression of that idea is [72,73]

$$\Delta\mu \approx \Delta\mu_0 + \left\langle \sum_j \varphi(\mathbf{j}) \right\rangle_{1/2}. \quad (31)$$

With this formula, the average can be evaluated by considering *one* solvent molecule, a probe molecule, in addition to the solute discharged to the extent 1/2. This molecular grouping can be studied on the basis of the dielectric model with the expectation that the dielectric model should give a physically valid description. The dielectric model can provide a pair potential of mean force for the additional solvent molecule relative to the half-discharged solute. The mean electrostatic potential that the water molecule expresses on the solute is then the quantity of interest. To obtain that quantity requires averaging over the Boltzmann factor of the dielectric model potential of mean force for the grouping.

The justification of this approach is that the formula Eq. (31) would give precisely the same answer as Eq. (30) if that latter result were precisely correct. However, if we are looking for one such formula to exploit with the dielectric model, Eq (31) is preferred because: (a) it uses the dielectric model in a region where it might be expected to be physically valid; and (b) Eq (31) requires considering only *one* water molecule in addition to the solute rather than two as would the last term of Eq (30).

More formally, we can argue as follows. The desired excess chemical potential can be expressed as

$$\Delta\mu = \Delta\mu_0 + \int_0^1 \left\langle \sum_j \varphi(\mathbf{j}) \right\rangle_{\xi} d\xi. \quad (32)$$

$\xi \in [0, 1]$ is a parameter that scales all the partial charges of the solute. The mean value theorem applied to the integral yields

$$\Delta\mu = \Delta\mu_0 + \left\langle \sum_j \varphi(\mathbf{j}) \right\rangle_{\xi^*}, \quad (33)$$

where $0 < \xi^* < 1$. The success of the dielectric model suggests that we use the estimate $\xi^* \approx 1/2$ and evaluate the average by exploiting the dielectric model itself. This more formal argument obviously further suggests that the precise value used for ξ^* , though near $1/2$, can be helpfully empiricized as sufficient experience is acquired with these methods.

In closing this section it is helpful to note some often mentioned alternatives for the molecular theory corresponding to this dielectric model. One alternative might be based upon the suggestion that a spatially local dielectric constant should be used. If a first solvation shell is structurally fixed and if a local dielectric constant is given to describe the polarization of that shell, then this is similar in spirit to the present model. However, more generally it must be admitted that a local dielectric constant is a ambiguous concept unless local means ‘macroscopically local.’ The macroscopic solution dielectric constant is unambiguous and the net polarization of the interior of a rigid molecular structure also is a simple physical concept. This level of modeling is therefore reasonable but we have refrained from extending the present model to elaborate those ideas in more difficult settings.

A second alternative is based upon the observation that on a molecular scale the dielectric response should be non-local. This non-local response would be characterized by a wave-vector dependent dielectric constant, $\hat{\epsilon}(k)$. This is a much less ambiguous approach than the ‘local dielectric constant’ idea mentioned above. However, it does not go as far as the second-order perturbation theory advocated here. The ‘non-local’ response approach would not typically include the linear perturbative term. The non-local response approach would typically compromise the description of short-ranged ‘packing’ interactions as they are expressed in the perturbative terms. Moreover, the $\hat{\epsilon}(k)$ is not necessarily simple [74,75].

6. Conclusions

This dielectric model [1,2] gives interesting and helpful results for the variation in solvation free energy with solute geometry. However, it typically significantly over-stabilizes classic attractive ion-pairing configurations.

In several cases, *e.g.* Fig. 6 and Fig. 8, the predictions of this dielectric model are quite similar to those of more ambitious theories. This comparison clearly teaches us about the performance of those more complicated theories for those cases: the phenomena described are unsuspectedly simple and those more complicated theories are at least qualitatively valid for those simple circumstances.

It is numerically feasible to solve this dielectric model to thermal accuracies for the excess chemical potential [23–25]. The integral equations Eqs. (2) and (3) that are the basis for the numerical boundary integral methods studied here have not been given previously in this context. The algorithmic discussion of Eq. (2) has laid the basis for a multigrid method of solution. Such methods are likely to be necessary for similarly accurate numerical solution of these models for much larger solutes. Eq. (3) will be particularly helpful for macroscopic surfaces such as solution interfaces and membranes. Eqs. (58), (63), and (64) show how these methods can be transferred directly to periodic boundary conditions. That will be important for two reasons. First, the best controlled quantitative results on hydration and electrostatic interactions utilize periodic boundary conditions on electrostatic interactions. Second, simulation of the hydration of macromolecules often involves periodic boundary conditions, only a few layers of hydrating water, and almost no direct investigation of system size effects; treatment of hydration on the basis of the dielectric model with and without periodic boundary conditions would be a natural first step towards getting quantitative thermodynamic limiting results for such solutions.

Finally, we draw attention to the connection discussed here of this dielectric model to molecular theory. As a proposal for going beyond current applications of dielectric models, the probe solvent molecule Eq. (31) is new. By reintroducing molecular solvation structure,

it is likely to correct the largest part of the errors of the dielectric model, *i.e.*, the quantitative inaccuracy for either molecular surface used of the contact minimum in Fig. 1 and of the barrier to escape from that contact minimum. As a guide in analyzing molecular statistical thermodynamic results, this relation has already been useful. At a more practical level, this approach should reduce the sensitivity of the model results on the radii-parameters. It should be cautioned however, that the dielectric model is clearly approximate and the quadratic theory also is approximate [33,34]. Typically, these results can be expected to be superseded for applications where molecular accuracy is important.

Acknowledgements

This work has benefitted from a helpful collaboration with scientists at 3M Corporation lead by David Misemer, and from discussions with a number of colleagues Richard Friesner, Barry Honig, Ron Levy, Alex Rashin, and Andrew Pohorille. This work has been supported by the Tank Waste Remediation System (TWRS) Technology Application program, under the sponsorship of the U. S. Department of Energy EM-36, Hanford Program Office, the Air Force Civil Engineering Support Agency, and the US-DOE under LANL Laboratory Directed Research and Development funds.

Appendix A: Integral formulations

We wish to write the equations to be solved as integral equations because those integral equations serve as the basis of the numerical methods here and because this is the most natural way to make contact with molecular theory. We consider the equation for the Green function, $G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$:

$$\nabla \bullet \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \nabla G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = -4\pi\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'). \quad (34)$$

$G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is the potential at $\mathbf{r}$ due to a unit charge at $\mathbf{r}'$. We can rearrange this into a perturbation theory standardly. Consider the reference problem

$$\varepsilon_0 \nabla \bullet \nabla G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = -4\pi\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'). \quad (35)$$

$G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is the potential at $\mathbf{r}$ due to a unit charge at $\mathbf{r}'$ for a uniform dielectric with dielectric constant ε_0 . Then the perturbation theory is

$$G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \int_V G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \nabla'' \bullet \left[\left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') - \varepsilon_0}{4\pi} \right) \nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') \right] d^3 r''. \quad (36)$$

When $\varepsilon_0 = 1$ we interpret this equation by noting that

$$\nabla'' \bullet \left[\left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') - \varepsilon_0}{4\pi} \right) \nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') \right] \quad (37)$$

is then the induced charge at $\mathbf{r}''$ due to a unit charge at $\mathbf{r}'$. The total potential $G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ at $\mathbf{r}$ is the sum of the bare potential $G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ of the unit source charge plus the bare potential of all the induced charges.

An integration by parts casts this into the form:

$$G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') - \int_V [\nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'')] \bullet \left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') - \varepsilon_0}{4\pi} \right) [\nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}')] d^3 r''. \quad (38)$$

The surface contributions vanish because we are here considering a charge distribution of finite extent and the potential is required to vanish at infinity. This form makes evident the well-known symmetry of $G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$. Now when $\varepsilon_0 = 1$ the interpretation is that

$$\left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') - \varepsilon_0}{4\pi} \right) [-\nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}')] \quad (39)$$

is the induced polarization — $4\pi \mathbf{P} = (\varepsilon - 1)\mathbf{E}$. Since $\nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \bullet \mathbf{u}$ is the potential at $\mathbf{r}$ due to a unit dipole $\mathbf{u}$ at $\mathbf{r}''$, the total potential $G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ at $\mathbf{r}$ is the sum of the bare potential $G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ of the unit source charge plus the bare potential of all the induced polarization.

The form

$$G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \int_V \left\{ \nabla'' \bullet \left[\left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') - \varepsilon_0}{4\pi} \right) \nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \right] \right\} G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') d^3 r'' \quad (40)$$

is obtained by another integration by parts. By elaborating the gradient operations we see that

$$\nabla'' \bullet \left[\left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') - \varepsilon_0}{4\pi} \right) \nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \right] = \left[\nabla'' \left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{4\pi} \right) \right] \bullet \nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') - \left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') - \varepsilon_0}{\varepsilon_0} \right) \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}''). \quad (41)$$

Our basic equation then becomes

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = \varepsilon_0 G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \int_V \left[\nabla'' \varepsilon_0 G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \right] \bullet \left[\frac{\nabla'' \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{4\pi \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')} \right] [\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}')] d^3 r''. \quad (42)$$

$\varepsilon_0 G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is the bare Green function for a uniform dielectric with dielectric constant one.

Thus we write

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \int_V \nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \bullet \left[\frac{\nabla'' \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{4\pi \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')} \right] \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') d^3 r'', \quad (43)$$

with the understanding that here $G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is the vacuum Green function. This integral form of Poisson's equation directly gives the correct answer for a uniform dielectric. It also admits a simple interpretation. $[\nabla'' \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')/4\pi] G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}')$ can be viewed as a surface density of dipoles. The remaining integrand factor $\nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'')$ is then the potential due to those surface dipoles. This formula has the following consistency: the indirect term on the right-side, that associated with the surface dipole distribution, is discontinuous across the surface. The value of such a discontinuity is $4\pi \times$ (the local surface density of dipoles). Here that is $4\pi[(\varepsilon - 1)/(4\pi)]G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ for $\mathbf{r}$ located on the surface. The left-side of this equation also is discontinuous and the amount of that discontinuity is $(\varepsilon - 1)G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$.

If we manipulate the Eq. (36) this way we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla'' \bullet [(\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') - \varepsilon_0) \nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}')] &= [\nabla'' \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')] \bullet [\nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}')] \\ &+ \left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') - \varepsilon_0}{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')} \right) \{ -4\pi \delta(\mathbf{r}'' - \mathbf{r}') - [\nabla'' \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')] \bullet [\nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}')] \}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Thus

$$G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \int_V G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \left[\frac{\nabla'' \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{4\pi \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')} \right] \bullet \nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}') d^3 r''. \quad (45)$$

Here again we understand that $G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is the vacuum Green function. This equation can be viewed as the basis of the previous boundary element numerical approaches [1,3,6,10,12,14,15,18]. If the sources are located at positions $\mathbf{r}'$ where the dielectric function $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}')$ is *one* then this equation states that the full potential can be composed as the bare

potential of those sources plus the bare potential due to charges distributed throughout regions of inhomogeneity of $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$.

To show the explicit correspondence with previous workers, we assume that all charges are located in regions for which $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) = 1$, right-sum over those charges, operate on Eq. (12) with $-\hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \nabla$ for $\mathbf{r}$ just inside the molecular surface to obtain

$$\hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}) = \hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \mathbf{E}_0(\mathbf{r}) + \int_S \hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \nabla G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \left(\frac{\varepsilon - 1}{4\pi\varepsilon} \right) \hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}') d^2 r'. \quad (46)$$

The right-most quantity in the integrand — the surface density of charge — is worked out as:

$$\begin{aligned} q(\mathbf{r}') &= \left(\frac{\varepsilon - 1}{4\pi} \right) \left(\frac{2}{\varepsilon + 1} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) (\hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}')/\varepsilon + \hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}')) \\ &= \left(\frac{\varepsilon - 1}{4\pi\varepsilon} \right) \hat{\mathbf{n}} \bullet \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{r}') \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

These integral formulations can be generalized to cases in which the zeroth order contribution is a solution for a similar problem with nonconstant $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r})$. Such generalizations will be helpful in treating molecules near surfaces. The required developments here follow the above work closely. We reconsider the reference problem and select

$$\nabla \bullet \varepsilon_0(\mathbf{r}) \nabla G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = -4\pi\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'). \quad (48)$$

$G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}')$ is the potential at $\mathbf{r}$ due to a unit charge at $\mathbf{r}'$ for the reference problem with dielectric constant $\varepsilon_0(\mathbf{r})$. Then the perturbation theory is

$$G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \int_V G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \nabla'' \bullet \left[\left(\frac{\Delta\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{4\pi} \right) \nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') \right] d^3 r'' \quad (49)$$

where we use the notation $\Delta\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) = \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) - \varepsilon_0(\mathbf{r})$. We then proceed in the obvious way:

$$G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \int_V G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \nabla'' \bullet \left[\left(\frac{\Delta\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{4\pi\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')} \right) \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') \nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') \right] d^3 r''. \quad (50)$$

Working out the ∇ 's gives

$$G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \varepsilon_0(\mathbf{r}')/\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}') + \int_V G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \nabla'' \bullet \left(\frac{\Delta\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{4\pi\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')} \right) \bullet \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') \nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') d^3 r''. \quad (51)$$

But

$$\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') \nabla'' \left(\frac{\Delta \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')} \right) = \varepsilon_0(\mathbf{r}'') \nabla'' \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{\varepsilon_0(\mathbf{r}'')} \right). \quad (52)$$

Then finally

$$\begin{aligned} G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}') &= G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \varepsilon_0(\mathbf{r}') \\ &+ \int_V G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \varepsilon_0(\mathbf{r}'') \nabla'' \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{\varepsilon_0(\mathbf{r}'')} \right) \bullet \nabla'' G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}') d^3 r''. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

This is the desired generalization of Eq. (45).

For the generalization of Eq. (43), we proceed similarly but start from the adjoint form:

$$G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') = G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') + \int_V \left\{ \nabla'' \bullet \left[\left(\frac{\Delta \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{4\pi} \right) \nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \right] \right\} G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') d^3 r'' \quad (54)$$

We then find

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) G(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') &= \varepsilon_0(\mathbf{r}) G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') \\ &+ \int_V \varepsilon_0(\mathbf{r}) \nabla'' G^{(0)}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \bullet \left(\frac{1}{4\pi} \right) [\nabla'' \ln \left(\frac{\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{\varepsilon_0(\mathbf{r}'')} \right)] \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') G(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') d^3 r''. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

Appendix B: Boundary integrals, periodic boundary conditions, and dielectric models

The methods above can be used also to solve these dielectric models in periodic boundary conditions. This may be important because almost all simulations of macroscopic matter utilize periodic boundary conditions; and many of those use the solution of Poisson's equation in periodic boundary conditions, the Ewald potential.

We start by noting that the Ewald potential could be constructed with a boundary integral method. This can be demonstrated in a classic fashion from Green's second formula [76]

$$\int_V d^3 r \left\{ f(\mathbf{r}) \nabla^2 g(\mathbf{r}) - g(\mathbf{r}) \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{r}) \right\} = \int_{\partial V} d^2 r \hat{n} \bullet \{ f(\mathbf{r}) \nabla g(\mathbf{r}) - g(\mathbf{r}) \nabla f(\mathbf{r}) \} \quad (56)$$

in the present notation. The integral on the right is over the surface of a unit cell of a Bravais lattice, *e.g.*, the surface of a cube. $\hat{n}$ is the outward pointing normal. We exploit this in the

traditional fashion with the traditional choice $f(\mathbf{r}) = 1/|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|$ and $g(\mathbf{r}) = \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r})$. Then $\nabla^2 f(\mathbf{r}) = -4\pi\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')$ and $\nabla^2 g(\mathbf{r}) = -4\pi(\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') - V^{-1})$. This gives the equation

$$\varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{r} - \int_V \frac{d^3 r'}{V|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} + \int_{\partial V} d^2 r' \hat{n} \bullet \left\{ \frac{\nabla' \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r}')}{|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} - \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r}') \nabla' \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}|} \right\}. \quad (57)$$

This notation assumes, and our argument depends on this construction, that the unit cell is centered on the source. This will not limit the generality of the result because we will use that device to construct the general periodic solution of interest. With this choice of origin, the Ewald electric field normal to the surface must be zero. Then

$$\varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{1}{r} - \int_V \frac{d^3 r'}{V|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'|} - \int_{\partial V} d^2 r' \hat{n} \bullet \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r}') \nabla' \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r}|} \quad (58)$$

Thus, the Ewald potential can be represented as the Coulomb potential due to a charge distribution within the cell plus the Coulomb potential due to a dipolar surface distribution. This equation might be used to determine the Ewald potential by discretizing the surface, taking the position $\mathbf{r}$ on the surface, and using Eq. (58) to determine $\varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r})$ on the surface. The periodic solution could then be constructed by periodic replication. However, this equation is properly deficient in one respect: it is ambiguous with respect to the addition of a spatial constant. Thus if $\bar{\varphi}(\mathbf{r})$ is a solution, so is $\bar{\varphi}(\mathbf{r}) + C$. It is traditional [78] and natural [79] to chose this constant so that

$$\int_V \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r}) d^3 r = 0. \quad (59)$$

With this backdrop, we reconsider the dielectric problem. A relevant Green's formula is now

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_V d^3 r \{ f(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \bullet [\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \nabla g(\mathbf{r})] - g(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \bullet [\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \nabla f(\mathbf{r})] \} \\ &= \int_{\partial V} d^2 r \hat{n} \bullet \{ f(\mathbf{r}) \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \nabla g(\mathbf{r}) - g(\mathbf{r}) \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \nabla f(\mathbf{r}) \} \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

We choose

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{r}) &= \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'), \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{r}) = -4\pi(\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') - V^{-1}), \\ g(\mathbf{r}) &= \varphi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}''), \nabla \bullet \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \nabla g(\mathbf{r}) = -4\pi(\delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'') - V^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

The final point to make about this application of Green's formulae is that in this case the surface contributions will vanish:

$$\int_{\partial V} d^2r \hat{n} \bullet \{ \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \varphi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') - \varphi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \nabla \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') \} = 0. \quad (62)$$

The reason for this is that all functions in the integrand are triply-periodic. Thus, the gradient at a surface point can always be matched against another with equal weight and opposite projection on the surface normal. The relations $\nabla \bullet \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \nabla f(\mathbf{r}) = (\nabla \varepsilon(\mathbf{r})) \bullet (\nabla f(\mathbf{r})) + \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \nabla^2 f(\mathbf{r})$ and $\varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') = \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r}' - \mathbf{r})$ then directly lead to

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \varphi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') &= \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') + \left(\frac{1}{4\pi} \right) \int_V d^3r'' \nabla'' \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'') \bullet \nabla'' \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'') \varphi(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') \\ &\quad + V^{-1} \int_V d^3r [\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}) \varphi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') - \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}')]. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

This should be compared to Eq. (43). Now if we use the conventional Ewald potential, then we have Eq. (59). Further, if we use Eq. (63) *without* the penultimate contribution, then $\varepsilon(\mathbf{r}') \varphi(\mathbf{r}')$ is a linear combination of just those conventional potentials. In that case, the neglected last term will be zero. Our conclusion is that the form of the equation need not change in going from the unbounded to the Ewald case provided we substitute the conventional Ewald potential for Coulomb's law.

A similar calculation starting from Eq. (56) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}') &= \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}') / \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}') + \int_V d^3r'' \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'') \left(\frac{\nabla'' \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')}{4\pi \varepsilon(\mathbf{r}'')} \right) \bullet \nabla'' \varphi(\mathbf{r}'', \mathbf{r}') \\ &\quad + V^{-1} \int_V d^3r [\varphi(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r}'') - \varphi_{Ewald}(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}'') / \varepsilon(\mathbf{r})]. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Again, if we use the conventional Ewald potential, the last term on the right vanishes.

Appendix C: Solid angle from sampled surface

Here we consider the formula Eq. (20). Our goal is to show how to use points sampled uniformly on the surface of a sphere to estimate the solid angle subtended by a plaque at the plaque point just outside the sphere.

Fig. 9 shows the geometry considered here. We take the z-axis through the plaque point with origin at the center of the sphere. The complication is that the solid angle required is referenced to the origin at the plaque point. The solid angle subtended just *inside* the plaque point is given by

$$\Omega_{inside} = 2\pi + \int H(\omega) d\omega \quad (65)$$

where $d\omega$ denotes the integration over the surface of a unit sphere centered at the plaque point and $H(\omega)$ is the indicator function for the angles ω for which the unit vector $\hat{\omega}$ points within the plaque. This integration can be implemented as

$$\Omega_{inside} = 2\pi + \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_{-1}^0 d(\cos \vartheta) H(\varphi, \vartheta). \quad (66)$$

In order to use sampling points uniformly distributed on the surface of the sphere we need to reference the integration to the center of the sphere rather than the plaque point. In that change of angular coordinates the azimuthal angle φ is unchanged but the polar angle ϑ transforms as

$$d(\cos \vartheta) = d(\cos \vartheta_s) / \left[2^{3/2} \sqrt{1 - \cos \vartheta_s} \right]. \quad (67)$$

The polar angle from the center of the sphere is ϑ_s . We then write

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{inside} &= 2\pi + \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_{-1}^0 H(\varphi, \vartheta) d(\cos \vartheta) \\ &= 2\pi + 4\pi \frac{\int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_{-1}^0 H(\varphi, \vartheta) d(\cos \vartheta)}{\int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_{-1}^1 d(\cos \vartheta_s)}. \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

This is in a form of an average:

$$\Omega_{inside} = 2\pi + \frac{4\pi}{2^{3/2}} \left\langle (1 - \cos \vartheta_s)^{-1/2} \right\rangle_0 \quad (69)$$

where we have used the transformation Eq. (67). The subscript 0 indicates that the sampling points should be uniformly distributed on the surface of the sphere.

It can be checked that this formula produces the correct answer when the plaque covers the entire sphere. When the plaque is a circular cap centered at the plaque point this formula produces

$$\Omega_{inside} = 2\pi \left(1 + \sqrt{(1 - \cos \vartheta^*)/2}\right) \quad (70)$$

where ϑ^* is the polar angle at the perimeter of the circular cap. The use of the engineering estimate

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \cos \vartheta^*)/2 &= 2\pi (1 - \cos \vartheta^*)/4\pi \\ &\approx \left(\frac{4\pi}{N}\right) \times \left(\frac{1}{4\pi}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

underlies the approximation Eq. (11).

The integrand of Eq. (69) is integrable but singular. This difficulty can be relieved by considering the complementary indicator function $1 - H(\varphi, \vartheta)$ and the complementary solid angle:

$$\begin{aligned} 4\pi - \Omega_{inside} &= \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \int_{-1}^0 d(\cos \vartheta) (1 - H(\varphi, \vartheta)) \\ &= \frac{4\pi}{2^{3/2}} \left\langle (1 - H(\varphi, \vartheta)) (1 - \cos \vartheta_s)^{-1/2} \right\rangle_0. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

But this complement is just the outside solid angle desired, $\Omega_{outside} = 4\pi - \Omega_{inside}$. Implementing this formula as a sampling estimate that uses the points uniformly distributed on the spherical area outside the plaque gives Eq. (20).

REFERENCES

- [1] Rashin, A. A. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1990**, 94, 1725.
- [2] Honig, B.; Sharp, K.; Yang, A.-S. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1993**, 97, 1101.
- [3] Miertus, S. ; Scrocco, E.; Tomasi, J. *Chem. Phys.* **1981**, 55, 117.
- [4] Warwicker J.; Watson, H. C. *J. Mol. Biol.* **1982**, 157, 671.
- [5] Gilson, M. K.; Rashin, A.; Fine, R.; Honig, B. *J. Mol. Biol.* **1985**, 183, 503.
- [6] Zauhar, R. J.; Morgan, R. S. *J. Mol. Biol.* **1985**, 186, 815.
- [7] Klapper, I.; Hagstrom, R.; Fine, R.; Sharp, K.; Honig, B. *PROTEINS: Structure, Function, and Genetics* **1986**, 1, 47.
- [8] Gilson, M. K.; Sharp, K. A.; Honig, B. H. *J. Comp. Chem.* **1987**, 9, 327.
- [9] Pascual-Ahuir, J. L.; Silla, E.; Tomasi, J.; Bonaccorsi, R. *J. Comp. Chem.* **1987**, 8, 778.
- [10] Rashin, A. A.; Namboodiri, K. *J. Phys. Chem.*, **1987**, 91, 6003.
- [11] Gilson, M. K.; Honig, B. H. *PROTEINS: Structure, Function, and Genetics* **1988**, 3, 32.
- [12] Zauhar, R. J.; Morgan, R. S. *J. Comp. Chem.* **1988**, 9, 171.
- [13] Davis, M. E.; McCammon, J. A. *J. Comp. Chem.* **1989**, 10, 386.
- [14] Yoon, B. J.; Lenhoff, A. M. *J. Comp. Chem.* **1990**, 11, 1080.
- [15] Juffer, A. H.; Botta, E. F. F.; van Keulen, B. A. M.; van der Ploeg, A.; Berendsen, H. J. C. *J. Comp. Phys.* **1991**, 97, 144.
- [16] Nicholls, A.; Honig, B. *J. Comp. Chem.* **1991**, 12, 435.
- [17] Snitzer, J. E.; Lambrakis, K. C. *J. Theor. Biol.* **1991**, 152, 203.

- [18] Wang, B.; Ford, G. P. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1992**, 97, 4162.
- [19] Oberoi, H.; Allewell, N. M. *Biophys. J.* **1993**, 65, 48.
- [20] Zhou, H.-X. *Biophys. J.* **1993**, 65, 955.
- [21] Mohan, V.; Davis, M. E.; McCammon, J. A.; Pettitt, B. M. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1992**, 96, 6428.
- [22] You, T. J.; Harvey, S. C. *J. Comp. Chem.* **1993**, 14, 484.
- [23] Simonson, T.; Brünger, A. T. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1994**, 98, 4683-4694.
- [24] Tucker, S. C.; Gibbons, E. M. *Structure and reactivity in aqueous solution: Characterization of chemical and biological systems*, edited by C. J. Cramer and D. G. Truhlar, *ACS Symposium Series* **568**, 198,(1994). (ACS, Washington DC, 1994).
- [25] Bharadway, R.; Windemuth, A.; Sridharan, S.; Honig, B.; Nicholls, A.; em J. Comp. Chem. **1995**, 16, 898.
- [26] Pratt, L. R.; Hummer, G.; García, A. E. *Biophys. Chem.* **1994**, 51, 147.
- [27] Tawa, G. J.; Pratt, L. R. In Cramer, C. J.; Truhlar, D. G., Eds. *Structure and Reactivity in Aqueous Solution: Characterization of Chemical and Biological Systems. ACS Symposium Series*; ACS: Washington DC, 1994, Vol. 568, p. 60.
- [28] Levy, R. M.; Belhadj, M.; Kitchen, D. B. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1991**, 95, 3627.
- [29] Smith, P. E.; . van Gunsteren, W. F *J. Chem. Phys.* **1994**, 100, 577.
- [30] Hirata, F.; Redfern, P.; Levy, R. M. *Int. J. Quant. Chem.* **1988**, 15, 179.
- [31] Figueirido, F.; Del Bueno, G. S.; Levy, R. M. *Biophys. Chem.* **1994**, 51, 235.
- [32] Tawa, G. J.; Pratt, L. R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1995**, 117, 1625.
- [33] Hummer, G.; Pratt, L. R.; García, A. E. LA-UR-95-1161, *J. Phys. Chem.* in press

- (1995). chem-ph# 9505005.
- [34] Hummer, G.; Pratt, L. R.; García, A. E. LA-UR-95-1612, *J. Phys. Chem.* in press (1995). chem-ph# 9507004.
- [35] Hammersley, J. M.; Handscomb, D. C. *Monte Carlo Methods*, Chapman and Hall, London, 1964, pp. 31-36.
- [36] Keng, H. L.; Yuan, W. APPLICATIONS OF NUMBER THEORY TO NUMERICAL ANALYSIS, (Springer-Verlag, NY, 1981).
- [37] Lubotzky, A.; Phillips, R.; Sarnak, P. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **1986**, 39, S149; *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **1987**, 40, 401.
- [38] Tichy, R. F. *J. Comp. Appl. Math.* **1990**, 31, 191.
- [39] Niederreiter, H. *Random Number Generation and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods*, (SIAM, Philadelphia, 1992).
- [40] Press, W. H.; Teukolsky, S. A.; Vetterling, W. T.; Flannery, B. P. *Numerical Recipes, The Art of Scientific Computing*, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, NY, 1992, §7.7.
- [41] Rowlinson, J. S.; Widom, B. *Molecular Theory of Capillarity*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1989), pp. 19-20.
- [42] Lebowitz, J. L.; Stell, G.; Baer, S. *J. Math. Phys.* **1965**, 6, 1282.
- [43] Rashin, A. A.; *J. Phys. Chem.* **1989**, 93, 4664.
- [44] Ford, G. P.; Wang, B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, 114, 10563.
- [45] Shang, H. S.; Head-Gordon, T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, 116, 1528.
- [46] Connolly, M. L. *J. Appl. Cryst.* **1985**, 18, 499.
- [47] See, for example, Jaswon, M. A. in *Topics in Boundary Element Research*, edited by C.

- A. Brebbia, **1**, 13(1984).
- [48] Rashin, A. A.; Honig, B. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1985**, 89, 5588.
- [49] Lim, C.; Bashford, D.; Karplus M. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1991**, 95, 5610.
- [50] Hummer, G; Soumpasis, D. M.; Neumann, M. **1994**, 81, 1155.
- [51] Guàrdia, E.; Rey. R.; Padró, J. A. *Chem. Phys.* **1991**, 155, 187.
- [52] Guàrdia, E.; Rey. R.; Padró, J. A. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1991**, 95, 2823.
- [53] Pettitt, B. M.; Rossky, P. J. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1986**, 84, 5836.
- [54] Smith, D. E.; Dang, L. X. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1994**, 100, 3757.
- [55] Jorgensen, W. L.; Buckner, J. K.; Huston, S. E.; Rossky, P. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1987**, 109, 1891.
- [56] Huston, S. E.; Rossky, P. J. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1989**, 93, 7888.
- [57] Chen, S. W.; Rossky, P. J. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1993**, 97, 6078.
- [58] Gorenstein, D. G.; Findley, J. B.; Luxon, B. A.; Kar, D. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **1977**, 475, 184.
- [59] Friedman R. A.; Mezei, M. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1995**, 102, 419.
- [60] Weiner, S. J.; Kollman, P. A.; Case, D. A.; Singh, U. C.; Ghio, C.; Alagona, G.; Profeta Jr., S.; Weiner, P. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1984**, 106, 765.
- [61] Chandrasekhar, J.; Smith, S. F.; Jorgensen, W. L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1985**, 107, 154.
- [62] Chiles, R. A.; Rossky, P. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1984**, 106, 6867.
- [63] Huston, S. E.; Rossky, P. J.; Zichi, D. A. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1989**, 111, 5680.
- [64] Madura, J. D.; Jorgensen, W. L. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1986**, 108, 2517.

- [65] Yu, H.-A.; Karplus, M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1990**, 112, 5706.
- [66] Jorgensen, W. L.; Gao, J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1988**, 110, 4212.
- [67] Radom, L.; Riggs, N. V. *Aust. J. chem.* **1982**, 35, 1071.
- [68] Yu, H.-A.; Pettitt, B. M.; Karplus, M. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1991**, 113, 2425.
- [69] Sharp, K.; A. Jean-Charles, Honig, B. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1992**, 96, 3822.
- [70] Press, W. H.; Teukolsky, S. A.; Vetterling, W. T.; Flannery, B. P. *Numerical Recipes, The Art of Scientific Computing*, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, NY, 1992, §2.6.
- [71] (a) Klopman, G. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1967**, 1, 200. (b) Rinaldi, D.; Rivail, J. L. *Theor. Chim. Acta* **1973**, 99, 4899; (c) Germer, H. A. *Theor. Chim. Acta* **1974**, 34, 145; (d) Hylton, J.; Christoffersen, R. E.; Hall, G. C. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1974**, 26, 501; (e) Miertus, S.; Kysel, O. *Chem. Phys.* **1977**, 21, 27; (f) S. Miertus, S.; Scrocco, E.; Tomasi, J. *Chem. Phys.* **1981**, 55, 117; (g) Bonaccorsi, R.; Cimiraglia, R.; Tomasi, J. *J. Comput. Chem.* **1983**, 4, 567; (h) Russel, S. T.; Warshel, A. *J. Mol. Biol.* **1985**, 185, 389; (i) Hoshi, H.; Sakurai, M.; Inoue, Y.; Chujo, R. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1987**, 87, 1107; (j) Mikkelsen, K.; Dalgaard, E.; Swannstrom, J. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1987**, 91, 3081; (k) Aguilar, M. A.; Olivares delValle, F.; *J. Chem. Phys.* **1989**, 129, 439; (l) King, G.; Warshel, A.; *J. Chem. Phys.* **1989**, 91, 3647; (m) Chudinov, G. E.; Napolov, D. V.; Basilevsky, M. V. *Chem. Phys.* **1991**, 160, 41; (n) Agren, H.; Mikkelsen, K. V. *J. Mol. Struct. (Theochem)* **1991**, 234, 425; (o) Wong, M. W.; Frisch, M. J. ; Wiberg, K. B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1991**, 113, 4776; (p) Cramer, C. J. ; Truhlar, D. G. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1991**, 113, 8305; (q) Ford, G. P. ; Wang, B. *J. Comput. Chem.* **1992**, 13, 229. (r) Rauhut, G.; Clark, T.; Steinke, T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1993**, 115, 9174; (s) Rosch, N.; Zerner, M. C. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1994**, 98, 5817; (t) Cramer, C. J.; Truhlar, D. G. *J. Comp-aid Molec. Des.* **1992**, 6, 629; (u) Rashin, A. A.; Young, L.; Topol, I.

A. *J. Biophys. Chem.* **1994**, 51, 359; (v) Rashin, A. A.; Bukatin, M. A.; Andzelm, J. N.; Hagler, A. T. *J. Biophys. Chem.* **1994**, 51, 375; (w) Tomasi, J.; Bonaccorsi, R.; Cammi, R.; Olivares del Valle, F. *J. Mol. Struct. (Theochem)* **1991**, 234, 401; (x) Tapia, O. *Theor. Chim. Acta* **1978**, 47, 157; (y) Tapia, O.; Poulain, E.; Sussman, F. *Theor. Chim. Acta* **1978**, 47, 171; (z) Mikkelsen, K. V.; Agren, H.; Hensen, J. A.; Helgaker, T. U. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1988**, 89, 3086; (aa) Rivail, J. L. *Compt. Rend. Acad. Sci. (Paris)* **1990**, 311, 307; (bb) Olivares del Valle, F. J.; Tomasi, J. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1991**, 150, 139; (cc) Aguilar, M. A.; Olivares del Valle, F. J.; Tomasi, J. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1991**, 150, 151; (dd) Olivares del Valle, F. J.; Bonaccorsi, R.; Cammi, R.; Tomasi, J. *J. Mol. Struct. (Theochem)* **1991**, 230, 295. (ee) Frisch, M. J.; Head-Gordon, M.; Trucks, G. W.; Foresman, J. B.; Schlegel, H. B.; Raghavachari, K.; Robb, M. A.; Wong, M. W.; Binkley, S. J.; Seeger, R.; Melius, R. C. F.; Baker, J.; Martin, R. L.; Kahn, L. R.; Stewart, J. J. P.; Topiol, S.; Pople, J. A. GAUSSIAN 91 (1991); (ff) Wong, M. W.; Wiberg, K. B.; Frisch, M. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, 114, 523; (gg) Wong, M. W.; Wiberg, K. B.; Frisch, M. J. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1992**, 114, 1645; (hh) Olivares, F. J.; Aguilar, M. A. *J. Comput. Chem.* **1992**, 13, 115; (ii) Chipot, C.; Rinaldi, D.; Rivail, J. L. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **1992**, 191, 287; (jj) Chipot, C.; Gorb, L. G.; Rivail, J. L. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1994**, 98, 1601; (kk) Chen, J. L.; Noodleman, L.; Case, D. A.; Bashford, D. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1994**, 98, 11059; (ll) Tawa, G. J.; Martin, R. L.; Pratt, L. R.; Russo, R. V. LA-UR-94-3425, submitted *J. Phys. Chem.* 1995; (mm) Tannor, D. J.; Marten, B.; Murphy, R.; Friesner, R. A.; Sitkoff, D.; Nicholls, A.; Ringhalda, M.; Goddard, W. A.; Honig, B. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **1994**, 116, 11875.

[72] Yu, H.-A.; Karplus, M. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1988**, 89, 2366.

[73] King, G.; Barford, R. A. *J. Phys. Chem.* **1993**, 97, 8798.

[74] Chandra, A.; Bagchi, B. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1989**, 91, 3056.

[75] Dolgov, O. V.; Kirzhnits, D. A.; Maksimov, E. G. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **1981**, 53, 81.

- [76] Bronshtein, I. N.; Semendyayev, K. A. *HANDBOOK OF MATHEMATICS* (Van Nostrand Reinhold, NY, 1985), p. 460.
- [77] Bronshtein, I. N.; Semendyayev, K. A. *HANDBOOK OF MATHEMATICS* (Van Nostrand Reinhold, NY, 1985), p. 476.
- [78] Brush, S. G.; Sahlin, H. L.; Teller, E. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1966**, 45, 2102.
- [79] Nijboer, B. R. A.; Ruijgrok, T. W. *J. Stat. Phys.* **1988**, 53, 361.

FIGURES

Figure 1. Theoretical results for the $\text{Na}^+ \cdots \text{Cl}^-$ potential of mean force in water under physiological conditions. The two molecular dynamics results differ principally in the fact that the upper molecular dynamics curve was obtained at non-zero concentration of salt; see Ref. [50]. The curve labeled ‘molecular dynamics 91’ is the result of Ref. [51]. A simple translation nearly suffices to superpose these two molecular dynamics results. The XRISM curve is redrawn from Ref. [53]. ‘Dielectric 89’ is redrawn from Ref. [43] and ‘dielectric 94’ is redrawn from Refs. [26,27]. The two dielectric calculations differ in that the earlier one used the Connolly molecular surface and the later one used the van der Waals surface. Those results are accurately the same in the region of the contact minimum but the different surfaces imply appreciably different results in the region of the free energy barrier.

Figure 2. Theoretical results for the $\text{Cl}^- \cdots \text{Cl}^-$ potential of mean force in water under physiological conditions. The two molecular dynamics results differ principally in the fact that the lower molecular dynamics curve was obtained at non-zero concentration of salt (Ref. [50]). The curve labeled ‘molecular dynamics 91’ is the result of Ref. [52]. A simple translation nearly suffices to superpose these two molecular dynamics results. The XRISM curve is redrawn from Ref. [53]. ‘Dielectric 89’ is redrawn from Ref. [43] and ‘dielectric 95’ is new here. The two dielectric calculations differ in the molecular surface assumed as discussed in the text and the caption of Fig. 1.

Figure 3. Theoretical potentials of mean force for approach of a Cl^- ion to a planar t-butyl⁺ ion. See Refs. [44,55].

Figure 4. Theoretical potentials of mean force for approach of Na^+ along the P-O bond of an exposed oxygen atom in methylphosphate⁻ — the asymmetric approach. See Refs. [56–58].

Figure 5. Theoretical potentials of mean force for approach of Na^+ along the bisector of the O-P-O bond angle of exposed oxygen atoms in methylphosphate⁻ — the symmetric approach. See Refs. [56–58]

Figure 6. Theoretical potentials of mean force for exchange of Cl^- in methylchloride by a symmetric $\text{S}_\text{N}2$ process along a linear reaction path. See Refs. [27,44,61–63]. The reaction coordinate is the difference between the two carbon-chloride distances.

Figure 7. Theoretical potentials of mean force for nucleophilic addition of hydroxide to formaldehyde. See Refs. [27,64,65]. The reaction coordinate plotted is the carbon-oxygen distance.

Figure 8. Solvation contribution to the potential of mean forces for model interconversion of *cis* [left, $\omega = 0^\circ$] to *trans* [right, $\omega = 180^\circ$]. See text and Refs. [66–68].

Figure 9. Geometry for calculation of the solid angle subtended at a plaque point.

















